Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/775,348	RODDY, CRAIG W.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	George Suchfield	3676
All Participants:	Status of Application	n: pending
(1) <u>George Suchfield</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Corey Tumey</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 28 April 2006	Time: Eastern Daylight-Saving, p.m.	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applican	plicant's representative)	
Part I.		•
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 102(b)		
Claims discussed: 1 and 71-82		
Prior art documents discussed: Berke et al (6,648,962		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separadirectly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separadid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum 	The examiner will provide a ate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appli	cant/Applicant's Representat	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was invited to further amend claim 1, via an examiner's amendment, in order to patentably distinguish over Berke et al by positively reciting a drilling step(s), but no agreement was reached. Applicant further inquired whether the examiner could rewrite the newly submitted composition claims71-82 into methods, but examiner indicated such beyond the scope of an examiner's amendment. The examiner suggested that claims to maiking a drilling fluid, per se, could be submitted in a divisional application, along with the presently non-elected composition claims.